BASIS FOR AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

Applicants have amended all claims to remove the numbers describing particular parts of the product, as claimed, to conform the claims to USPTO practice. Accordingly, Applicants assert that the claims, as filed and as amended, are not limited to the embodiments disclosed in the drawings.

In the Office Action, the USPTO advised that Claims 48, 50 and 51 were merely objected to, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicants have rewritten Claim 32 to include the limitations of allowable Claim 48. In addition, Applicants have rewritten allowable Claim 50 an independent claim by incorporating the limitations of independent Claim 32. Other amendments to the claims include a) incorporation of the limitations of Claims 46 and 47 into Claim 51 and cancellation of Claims 46 and 47; incorporation of the limitations of Claim 56, 57 and 58 into Claim 54 and the cancellation of Claims 56, 57 and 58; changing the dependency of Claims 59, 60 and 61 because of earlier amendments; adding new Claim 66, which claims the limitations of Claim 54 but depends on amended Claim 50; and adding new Claim 67, which claims the limitations of Claim 59 but depends on new Claim 66. Thus, Applicants have amended all claims to depend on subject matter which the Examiner has indicated is allowable.

Appl. No. 10/594,830 Page 18

No new subject matter is introduced based on any of these amendments.

DRAWINGS

Applicants submit new drawings which address all objections of the Examiner, which new drawings are attached to this Amendment as Exhibit A. No new subject matter is introduced by any of the amendments to the drawings.

Page 19

DISCUSSION

Drawings

The USPTO objected to all drawings and requested new corrected drawings. New corrected drawings are attached as Exhibit A which conform to the requirements of the USPTO.

Claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. Section 112

The USPTO rejected Claims 46 and 47 as being indefinite. This rejection has been overcome as the limitations of each of these claims have been incorporated into other claims and Claims 46 and 47 have been canceled.

Claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. Section 103

The USPTO rejected Claims 32-45, 49 and 52-65 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103 as being unpatentable over Khan, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,791,515 in view of Nilson, U.S. Patent No. 3,921,851. Notwithstanding, the USPTO indicated that Claims 48, 50 and 51 were merely objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants reserve the right to contest the rejection of the USPTO in a later filed divisional application.

Notwithstanding, Applicants have amended all claims

Appl. No. 10/594,830 Page 21

consistent with the indication of allowability by the Examiner. Specifically, Applicants have incorporated the limitations of Claim 48 into independent Claim 32. In addition, Applicants have incorporated all of the limitations of Claim 50 into Claim 32 in a new independent Claim 50. Various other amendments to the claims have been made and two new claims are added which are consistent with the claims that have been indicated to be allowable by the USPTO. Accordingly, all claims of the Application should be allowable.

CONCLUSION

As Applicants have amended all claims to contain allowable subject matter, as indicated in the Office Action, Applicants request the issuance of a Notice of Allowance. If there are any questions concerning this Amendment or any of the claims or drawings, please contact Applicants' counsel.

Respectfully submitted,

Scott R. Cox

Reg. No. 31,945 Customer No. 68072

LYNCH, COX, GILMAN & GOODMAN, P.S.C.

500 West Jefferson Street, Ste 2100

Louisville, Kentucky 40202

(502) 589-4215

Date: May 5, 2010

CERTIFICATE OF EFS SUBMISSION (37 C.F.R. § 1.8(a)(i)(1)(C))

I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being submitted to the Patent and Trademark Office via the Office Electronic Filing System in accordance with § 1.6(a)(4).

Date: May 5,2010

Wolley Hwit

SRC/hh

 $R: \label{lem:reduced_problem} R: \label{lem:reduced_problem} Archive the lemma shows the le$

108309.14590